

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 18-20, 23-25, 38, 41, and 54-56 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 16, 38, 41, and 55 are amended herein. Claim 56 is canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 18-20, 23-25, 38, 41, and 54-55 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Support for the claim amendments and is found throughout the specification, including, for example, at paragraph 50.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants' representatives and Examiner discussed the pending claims and cited references during a telephone interview conducted on November 2, 2010. Agreement was reached that amendments similar to those made herein would overcome the rejections of claims 1, 16, 38, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. No specific agreement was reached for the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants thank Examiner for his time.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 16, 38, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, Examiner rejects the language of "prior application with focus" as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to replace "prior" with "first" and also to recite that an application with focus comprises "an application being used by a user of the computer to enter text." Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 38, 55, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher (U.S. Pat. 6,631,345) in view of Chang (U.S. Pat. 6,968,509) and Weber et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,305,205). Claims 3-5, 10, and 54 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Chang and Gray (U.S. Pat. App. 2005/0060719). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Chang and Gray and Yee (U.S. Pat. 6,480,924). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Chang and Weber and Tervo (U.S. Pat. 6,907,577). Claims 16-18 and 41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gray and Chang. Claim 19-20 and 23-25 are rejected as being unpatentable

over Gray in view of Chang and Jade (U.S. Pub. 2003/0001854). Applicants traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims and discusses the rejections together for clarity.

Claim 1 recites a method for determining an event associated with an application. Claim 1 recites in part:

receiving, with the capture processor, a plurality of keystrokes associated with a first application with focus monitored by the capture processor, the first application with focus comprising an application being used by a user of the computer to enter text;  
determining, with the capture processor, that focus has changed from the first application monitored by the capture processor to a second application monitored by the capture processor, wherein focus changes when the user switches from using the first application to using the second application to enter text;  
resetting, with the capture processor, the keystrokes captured from the first application by clearing the captured keystrokes responsive to determining that the focus has changed;  
...

Examiner asserts that Chang teaches “determining...that focus has changed...” Chang discloses a method of recording user-driven events within a computer application by detecting changes in focus within the application caused by mouse movements. In col. 1, ll. 54-67, cited in the office action, Chang states that “the focus of the application includes where a mouse pointer is located in a graphical user interface of the application, such as a focus on a particular button of a toolbar that causes the button to have a raised appearance.” In col. 6, ll. 19-37, also cited in the office action, Chang states that “the CPU monitors for a change in focus, such as the mouse-pointer moving to different objects within the GUI.”

Although using similar language of “change” and “focus”, Chang’s change in focus is simply a mouse pointer moving from one button to another button within a single application. Unlike the claimed invention, Chang does not disclose “determining, with the capture processor, that focus has changed *from the first application* monitored by the capture processor *to a second application* monitored by the capture processor, *wherein focus changes when the user switches from using the first application to using the second application to enter text.*”

Examiner further asserts that Gray teaches “resetting” in the manner claimed. Gray discloses a method for capturing user events that are associated with screen objects on a

computer display so that the events may later be reproduced. An event engine captures user events, such as keystrokes and mouse clicks, through application programming interfaces (APIs) that are supported by the applications being monitored. However, the event engine does not reset any of the events received from the APIs when the user switches from one application to another. In fact, Gray does not highlight any specific actions that are performed responsive to a focus change, let alone an action that involves resetting.

Examiner suggests that Gray discusses the claimed resetting at paragraph 42. Here, Gray describes a command that allows a user to start a new recording with the event engine. When the user presses the “new” button, it “resets the memory of the event engine...and initializes states for a new recording.” The office action at paragraph 13 asserts that resetting the memory is akin to resetting keystrokes and initializing states is akin to a change in focus. Claim 1 now recites that changes in focus occur when a user *“switches from using the first application to using the second application to enter text.”* Thus, Gray’s teaching is inapposite to the amended claim. Moreover, Gray does not disclose any relationship between resetting memory and initializing states aside from the fact that both are triggered by pressing the “new” button. In other words, Gray does not reset memory responsive to initializing states. Accordingly, Gray does not disclose “resetting, with the capture processor, the keystrokes captured from the first application by clearing the captured keystrokes *responsive to determining that the focus has changed.*”

None of the other references remedy the deficiencies of Chang or Gray. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art considering the teachings of the cited references, either individually or in the combinations proposed by Examiner, would not have found claim 1 obvious. Independent claims 16, 38, and 41 have been amended to recite features similar in scope to those found in claim 1. The other independent and dependent claims are not obvious for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection and recognize that the claims recite allowable subject matter.

### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejections for the reasons provided above and allow the application. Applicants invite Examiner

to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/22/2010

By: /Frank B. Yang /  
Frank B. Yang, Reg No. 65,788  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7143  
Fax: (650) 938-5200